

### Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated January 18, 2008, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

### Interview Summary

A telephone interview was conducted on March 07, 2008 between Examiner Addy and Applicant's representative. During the interview the deficiencies of Sayko were discussed. Particularly, it was discussed that Sayko does not describe retrieving and restoring the private communication information into the outgoing communication.

It was also discussed in regards to claim 26 that the recitation "*an outgoing communication from the out of network entity*" was a broad generic phrase and may encompass a second message or the first message returning to the network or even the first message that was processed out-of network then reintroduced to the network. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments would overcome the current art and requested that written amendments and arguments be presented.

### Claim Objections

Claim 27 is objected to for depending from cancelled claim 1. Claim 27 has been amended to depend from independent claim 26 and now has proper dependency. As such, the objection may be withdrawn.

### 102 Rejections

Claims 26-28 and 31-50 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Sayko (US Pat 6,418,210). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

#### Claims 26-28 and 35-43

The Office Action rejects independent claim 26 by asserting that Sayko discloses each and every claim element. However, amended independent claim 26 recites elements not taught or disclosed by Sayko. As a representative example, amended independent claim 26 recites, in pertinent part:

“[a] method for a communication network to restore private communication information to a communication...comprising...receiving, into the network, an outgoing communication from the out-of-network entity; retrieving the private communication information and placing the private communication information into the outgoing communication; and forwarding the outgoing communication to a forwarding destination within the network ...”

Sayko fails to describe receiving *into the network*, an outgoing communication from the out-of-network entity and fails to describe forwarding the outgoing communication to a *forwarding destination within the network*. In its rejection on page 3, the Office Action specifically equates Sayko’s IP network 110 to the recited “network”, the PSTN 112 network to the recited “out-of-network entity” and a TCAP message to an “outgoing communication from the out-of-network entity”. (Col. 4, l. 27-58). However, given this construction, Applicant respectfully asserts that Sayko fails to describe each and every claim element.

Sayko does not describe receiving *into the network*, an out-going communication from the out-of-network entity. In Sayko, an IP message is placed from the IP network to the PSTN and its caller information is stored in the buffer 118 outside the IP network. Sayko expressly describes that the return TCAP message from the PSTN is “intercepted” by a gateway controller 2004 before it enters the IP network. (Col. 4, l. 54-56). After adding the caller information to the TCAP message from the buffer 118, the TCAP message is sent back to the PSTN network. (Col. 4, l. 56-58). Because Sayko describes that the caller information is stored in a buffer outside the IP network (Fig. 1) and that the TCAP message is intercepted before entering the IP network and then returned to the PSTN, Sayko does not describe “receiving, into the network, an outgoing communication from the out-of-network entity ...” Because the TCAP message never enters the IP network, Sayko can not describe “forwarding the outgoing communication to a forwarding destination within the network” because it never enters the IP network. The TCAP message of Sayko is never received into the IP network and is then sent right back to the PSTN by the Gateway Interface.

Because Sayko fails to describe each and every claim element of amended independent claim 26, amended independent claim 26 is not anticipated by Sayko. Amended independent claims 31 and 35 recite similar subject matter and are allowable

for at least the same reasons. Claims 27-30, 32-34 and 36-43 depend from an allowable independent claim 26, 32 or 35 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

#### Claims 44-46

The Office Action rejects independent claim 44 by asserting that Sayko discloses each and every claim element. However, amended independent claim 44 recites elements not taught or disclosed by Sayko. Amended independent claim 44 recites, in pertinent part:

“[a] routing module for removing, storing, and restoring private communication information of an out-of-network communication, comprising:

means for...restoring the private communication information to the out-of-network communication from the out-of-network communication entity prior to forwarding the communication to a network entity...”

Independent claim 44 has been amended to clarify that after restoring the private communication information to the out-of-network communication from the out-of-network communication entity the out-of-network communication is forwarded to a network entity. As discussed above in regards to independent claim 1, Sayko explicitly describes that its TCAP message is intercepted outside the IP network and therefore the TCAP message is never forwarded into the IP network. As such, Sayko does not describe restoring the private communication information to the out-of-network communication from the out-of-network communication entity prior to forwarding the communication to a network entity.

Because Sayko fails to describe each and every claim element, amended independent claim 44 is allowable over Sayko for at least these reasons. Claims 45-46 depend from an allowable independent claim 44 and are allowable for at last these same reasons.

#### Claims 47-50

The Office Action rejects independent claim 47 by asserting that Sayko discloses each and every claim element. However, amended independent claim 47 recites elements not taught or disclosed by Sayko. Amended independent claim 47 recites, in pertinent part:

“[a] control module for preventing private communication information from exiting [[a]] the network, comprising...means for restoring the private communication information to a communication entering the network.”

Independent claim 47 has been amended to clarify that the private communication information is restored to a communication re-entering the network. As discussed above in regards to independent claim 1, Sayko explicitly describes that its TCAP message is intercepted outside the IP network and therefore the TCP message never enters or re-enter the IP network. As such, Sayko does not describe a means for restoring the private communication information to a communication entering the network.

Because Sayko fails to describe each and every claim element, Sayko does not anticipate amended independent claim 47. As such, amended independent claim 47 is allowable over Sayko for at least these reasons. Claims 48-50 depend from an allowable independent claim 47 and are allowable for at least these same reasons.

### 103 Rejections

Claims 29-30 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sayko in view of what appears to be Official Notice. However, Applicant respectfully points out that claims 29-30 depend from an allowable amended independent claim 26 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above in regards to the §102 rejections.

### Conclusion

Applicant asserts that the application including claims 26-50 is in condition for allowance. Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 02, 2008

/Arno T. Naeckel /  
Arno T. Naeckel  
Reg. No. 56,114

Withers & Keys, LLC  
P.O. Box 71355  
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355  
(678) 565-4748